170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

- Speaker McPike: "Senator Munizzi, would you like to give the prayer today? Senator, we would be very pleased if you would give the invocation. It's not necessary to leave, Senator, please. Well, if you don't want to give the invocation, why don't you dance with Billy. The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Keith Michaels of the United Methodist Church in Georgetown. Reverend Michaels is the guest of Representative Mike Weaver. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Reverend Michaels: "Let us pray. Eternal and gracious God, we thank You for this day that You have given unto us, our life, our families, our great State of Illinois. We ask, dear God, that these men and women will make the right decisions for this state, our country and our world to proclaim peace and justice for all humankind. And give them the wisdom and the insight on all these different Bills, Amendments, gambling and others, that Thy Will be done. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Stepan."
- Stepan et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich, do you have any excused absences?"
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, none that have been reported to me.

 I'll say we're all here until I hear otherwise."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative...Senator Cronin is missing today. He's absent today. Representative Cronin."

170th Legislative Day

- November 17, 1992
- Speaker McPike: "Is he an excused absence? Excused absence, thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. One hundred fifteen Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Ed Maloney, Representative Charles

 Lomanto, Representative Michael Smith, will you approach
 the podium, please."
- Speaker McPike: "Charles Lomanto. Thank you. We have with us Judge, the Honorable Stuart Shiffman from Springfield, who will swear in three new Members."
- Judge Shiffman: "Gentlemen, if you'll raise your right hand and repeat after me. I, and state your name, do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Illinois and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the Office of Representative and the General Assembly of the State of Illinois for my Representative District to the best of my ability. Congratulations."
- Speaker McPike: "The Chair would like the three new Members to say a few words to the House. First is Ed Maloney."
- Maloney: "Thank you, Mr. McPike. Just like to thank Speaker Madigan for arranging this ceremony. I'd like to thank my family and friends for all their support. I'd like to thank committeemen Hinds, McNamara and Rita for having the confidence in me to provide me with this opportunity. And I'm asking for the Members patience and help for the next several weeks. Thank you very much."
- Speaker McPike: "Charles Lomanto."
- Lomanto: "Just like to thank you all for the warm welcome that most of you have given me, and I look forward to working with both sides of the Party here. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "And Representative Michael Smith."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Smith: "Alright. I'd like to thank the community that sent me here and the people that were involved in getting me here, and I would like to thank you all for the opportunity to serve the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, Introductions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction - First Reading of Bills. House Bill 4239, offered by Representative Balanoff, A Bill for an Act relating to the office of regional superintendent of schools, amending named Acts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4240, offered by Representative McGuire, A Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act by changing Section 2. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4241, offered by Representative Black, A Bill for an Act in relation to compensation for Persian Gulf veterans. First Reading of these Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Committee Report."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Committee on Rules has met and pursuant Rule 29(c)3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on November 17, 1992. House Bills #178, 714, 2104, 4213, 4216 and 4217. Signed John Matijevich, Chairman. A Report from the Committee on Rules, Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee on Rules reports that on November 17, 1992, the Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to House Rule 46.1 made the following Report on House Bill Amendatory Vetoes by the Governor. Compliance is House Bill 1352, 2979, 3187, 3266, 3290, 3555, 3674 and 3843. Noncompliance are House Bills 1528, 3315, 3460, 3479, 3519, 3641, 3672, 3867, 3884 and 4188. Signed John Matijevich, Chairman."

Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2315 offered by Representative Hensel; House Resolution 2316, offered by Representative

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Hensel; House Resolution 2318, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 2319, offered by Representative Obrzut; House Resolution 2320, offered by Representative Curran; House Resolution 2321, offered by Representative House Resolution 2322, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2324, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 2327, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2328, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2331, offered by Representative Mulcahey. House Resolution 2332, offered by Representative McGann; House Resolution 2333, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2334, offered by Representative J. Hoffman; House Resolution 2339, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2340, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2341, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2342, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2343, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2344, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2345, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2346, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2347, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2348, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2349, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2350, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2352, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 2353, offered by Representative Harris; House Resolution 2354, offered by Representative Obrzut; House Resolution 2355, offered by Representative Marinaro; House Resolution 2356, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 2357, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2358, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2359, offered by Representative

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

DeJaegher; House Resolution 2360, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2364, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2365, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2366, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2367, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2368, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2369, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2370, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2371, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2372, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2373, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2374, offered by Representative McNamara; House Resolution 2375, offered by Representative Hicks; House Resolution 2376, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge; House Resolution 2379. offered Representative Obrzut; House Resolution 2380, offered by Representative Kubik; House Resolution 2382, offered Representative Capparelli; House Resolution 2383, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2385, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 2387, offered Representative J. Hoffman; House Resolution 2390, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2391, offered Representative Black; House Resolution 2392, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2393, offered Representative Balanoff; House Resolution 2394, offered by Representative Ryder; House Resolution 2395, offered Representative Ryder; House Resolution 2396, offered by Representative Curran; House Resolution 2398, offered Representative Edley; House Resolution 2399, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2400, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2401, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2402, offered by

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2403, offered by Representative Keane; House Resolution 2404, offered Representative J. Hoffman; House Resolution 2405, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2406, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2407, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2408, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2409, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2410, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2412, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2413, offered Representative Novak; House Resolution 2416, offered by Representative Harris; House Resolution 2417, offered Representative Obrzut; House Resolution 2419, offered by Representative Trotter; House Resolution 2420, offered Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2423, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2424, offered Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2425, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2426, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2427, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2428, offered by Representative J. Hoffman; House Resolution 2429, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2430, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2431. offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2432, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2434, offered Representative McGann; House Resolution 2436, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 2437, offered Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2438, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2439, offered Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2440, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2441, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2442, offered by

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2443, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2444, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2445, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2446, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2447, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2448, offered Representative Mautino; House Resolution 2449, offered by Representative J. Hoffman; House Resolution 2450, by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2451, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2453, offered by Representative Parcells; House Resolution 2455, offered Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2456, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2457, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2458, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2459, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2460, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2461, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2462, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2463, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2464, offered by Representative Trotter; House Resolution 2466, offered Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2467, offered by Representative Trotter; House Resolution 2468, offered by Representative Hannig; House Resolution 2469, offered Representative Leitch; House Resolution 2471, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2472, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2473, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2475, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 2476, offered by Representative Wennlund; House Resolution 2477, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2478, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2479, offered

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2480, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2481, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2482, offered by Representative William Peterson; House Resolution 2483, offered Representative William Peterson; House Resolution 2484, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2486, offered by Representative Phelan; Resolution 2487, offered by Representative Marinaro; House Resolution 2489, offered by Representative Capparelli; House Resolution 2492, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 2493, offered by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 2494, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2495, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2496, offered by Representative Harris; House Resolution 2497, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2499, offered by Representative Balanoff; Resolution 2500, offered by Representative Black; House 2502, offered by Representative House Resolution Capparelli; House Resolution 2506, offered by Representative Martinez; House Resolution 2507, offered Representative Trotter; House Resolution 2508, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2510, offered by Representative McNamara; House Resolution 2511, offered by Representative McNamara; House Resolution 2512, offered Representative Mautino; House Resolution 2513, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2514, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2515, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2516, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2517, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2518, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2519, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2520, offered by

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Representative Barnes; House Resolution 2521, offered by Representative Barnes; House Resolution 2522, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2523, offered Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2524, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2525, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2526, offered by Representative McGann; House Resolution 2527, offered by Representative Barnes; House Resolution 2528, offered Representative Marinaro; House Resolution 2529, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2530, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2531, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2532, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2533, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2534, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2535, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2536, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 2537, offered Representative Wennlund; House Resolution 2538, offered by Representative Wennlund; House Resolution 2539, offered Representative Hasara; House Resolution 2541, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2542, offered by Representative Barnes; House Resolution 2543, offered Representative Phelan; House Resolution 2544, offered by Representative Marinaro; House Resolution 2547, offered Representative McDonough; House Resolution 2550, offered by Representative Regan; House Resolution 2551, offered by Representative Deuchler; House Resolution 2552, offered Representative Deuchler; House Resolution 2554, offered by Representative McDonough; House Resolution 2560, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2561, offered Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2564, offered by Representative McCracken; House Resolution 2565, offered by

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Representative Persico; House Resolution 2567, offered by Representative Leitch; House Resolution 2568, offered by Representative Marinaro; House Resolution 2570, offered by Representative Currie. House Joint Resolution 161, Curran; House Joint Resolution 162, Parke."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2317, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2323, offered by Representative Davis; House Resolution 2325, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2326, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2329, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2330, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2335, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2336, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2337, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2338, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 3551 (sic - 2351), offered by Representative Hultgren; House Resolution 2561 (sic -2361), offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge; Resolution 2562 (sic - 2362), offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2563 (sic -2363), offered Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2377, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2378, offered Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2381, offered by Representative Mautino; House Resolution 2384, offered Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2386, offered by

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Representative Anthony Young; House Resolution offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2389, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution offered by Representative Regan; House Resolution 2411, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2415, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2421, offered by Representative Shirley Jones; House Resolution 2422, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2433, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2435, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2452, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2454, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2465, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2474, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2485, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2488, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2490, offered by Representative Anthony Young; House Resolution 2491, by Representative Doederlein; offered Resolution 2498, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2501, offered by Representative Regan; House Resolution 2503, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2504, offered by Representative Morrow; Resolution 2505, offered by Representative Morrow; House Resolution 2509, offered by Representative Daniels; Resolution 2540, offered by Representative Shaw; House Resolution 2545, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge; House Resolution 2546, offered by Representative McDonough; House Resolution 2548, offered by Representative McDonough; House Resolution 2549, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2555, offered by Representative LeFlore;

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

House Resolution 2556, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2557, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2558, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2559, offered by Representative Johnson; House Resolution 2562, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge; House Resolution 2563, offered by Representative LeFlore; House Resolution 2566, offered by Representative Davis."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "This is on a Motion on a Death Resolution."

Davis: "We're offering a Death Resolution and asking that the entire Body join us in submitting a Death Resolution for Don Nash, the former lobbyist for Pepsi-Cola. I think everyone in the Body... Coca-Cola, everyone in here knew him. He had become a very respected individual in the state, working very hard for the company he represented and yet being friends with us, being very helpful to children in offering a lot of sport programs for the disadvantaged children over the State of Illinois in the summer program through the help of his company. So we ask and urge that all of the House join us in offering a Death Resolution for Mr. Don Nash, Lobbyist for Coca-Cola. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the Lady asks leave to add all Members as Cosponsors to the Death Resolution, and leave is granted. And with that Motion, Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2470, offered by Representative Satterthwaite. House Resolution 2553, offered by Representative Martinez."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction - First Reading of Bills. House Bill 4243, offered by Representative Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code by adding Section 12-612. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4242, offered by Representative Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act in relation to religious tax exemptions. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to the Members of the House some young people who came down to Springfield to talk about how it is their lives have started out a lot better than they might have. I have with me a young lady named Catrice and Representative Jones has Jennifer, and we have baby 'Peaches' in Representative Jocelyn is with Representative Morrow. Schakowsky's arms. We have John with Representative Stern and Lakisha with Representative Lou Jones. The reason these people have come down is because they were part, their mothers were part of special programs to help pregnant women move off drugs and substance abuse so their babies could be born drug-free. The reason these programs work is because fund those programs and these young ladies and young gentlemen are here to ask us to override a veto of a Bill that would stop...would stop babies from having the same kind of healthy start they have enjoyed. So they'll be the House floor for a few minutes. Do come over and say hello. They are anxious to meet you. They're anxious lobby you."

Speaker McPike: "Page 9 of the Calendar. Representative Matijevich. A Motion on House Bill 2703. Representative

170th Legislative Day

Black, for what reason do you rise?"

November 17, 1992

Black: "I just wanted to make sure that you saw that my light was on in plenty of time, depending on what his Motion is, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder. For what reason do you rise?"

Ryder: "For the same purpose, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich on the Motion. Motion #7."

Matijevich: "Speaker...The Motion is a...a Reduction Veto on House Bill 2703. Under House Bill 2703, as all of you know, during the regular Session of the General Assembly...the House and the Senate both were...acted in a very fiscally conservative manner. We passed the General Assembly Budget at the 10.1% or 3.4 million below what we spent in the FY92 Appropriations. The Governor's Veto would've further reduced the General Assembly's Budget by...1...\$1,866,700. This action by the Governor allowed to stand would leave the General Assembly with an operating budget of 15.6% below...below its FY92 level. This would be a reduction in operating funds of nearly 5.3 million dollars. The Governor on the other hand reduced his operating budget by only 6% below the FY92 level. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my Motion is to restore the funds which were reduced by the Governor and allow the General Assembly still to operate below its 50...FY92 level by 10%. We acted in a very fiscally conservative manner, and I think we should be allowed to have the Appropriation at the level that we passed operated conservatively. because Therefore, Ι appreciate your support of my Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder on the Motion."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Could we have a little quiet...just a little quiet, please. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Let me ask for your attention on this, the first issue that comes before the Veto Session. We made tough decisions last spring and submitted a budget to Governor. A budget that was not balanced. The Governor balanced the budget by making equally tough decisions. of those decisions was to reduce the Appropriation for the General Assembly. We all then went through election campaigns in which we said government should be downsized and that the State of Illinois should live within means. And now, the very first issue that comes before us, is an attempt to put money back in the budget, not for DASA, not for Public Aid, not for Mental Health, but for the General Assembly operations. I suggest that you do not restore this Veto, I suggest that you keep the promises that were made, by living within our means and not make the very first vote that we come back to feather the nest of the General Assembly. We of all people, should be doing Thank you, our best to live within the budget. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion, and at least \$800,000 of that is a nonrecurring expense, and that is the Reapportionment expense, 400,000 for each side of the aisle. That's 800,000 never coming back. Right there, the number becomes not 1.8 million, but one million. The question is, shall we take a cut, a fair commensurate cut along with the rest of government, and I think the answer has to be yes. I

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

understand everyone's desire to avoid layoffs. I know the secretaries are getting alarmed today because their notices of layoffs are coming, but this is not going to be a painless process. The Governor was under no requirement to pass the budget...or to sign the budget as passed, and I think 1.8, actually one million dollar cut, is not unfair. Over both fiscal years, this Governor has taken a substantial reduction in his own budget, including a reduction in head count. He's asking us to do the same. This is a fair request. Let's bite the bullet and show the public that we can live by the standards we set."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig. Gary Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. had the opportunity when we heard the Budget Committee Hearings to be the Chairman of that Committee, and when the Governor came to our Committee with his Appropriation for his office, he said that he wanted to take a 5% And he said how he would do it, and we looked at it, and we agreed. And we said, if that is the way you want to run Mr. Governor, we will your office, give you that Now the Governor also asked the General opportunity. Assembly to make a 5% cut in the operations of our and we did that as well. We put together a budget that we was...that was less than last year, by 10% the way I it, by 10%, and also gave us the opportunity to run the House of Representatives in a fair and efficient manner. Now, we met the Governor's expectation, we met the target that he gave us when we put the budget together, and I that we acted in good faith and that we should not now be penalized. I would suggest to everyone, that for this amount of money, that we should restore this money, that we should be proud of the cuts that we did make in all

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

agencies, including the General Assembly, and that we should get on with the business of the House."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I normally don't rise on the matters affecting the General Assembly's budget, because it's quite political in nature sometimes, but the budget was cut this spring, and I don't know if the general public understands how we're operating in this chamber today at this very moment. We have telephones. We have no telephones at our desks. We can not call a constituent. Our telephones in our offices across the way in the Stratton Building are restricted. cannot call anywhere but Springfield. We cannot call our District Office. We cannot call any constituents back They cannot get through to us, we cannot get through home. What kind of a crazy way this is to say we're going to begin a new Legislative Session in the General Assembly. This is the result of Governor Edgar's Veto. I don't see him saying that he is doing without telephone service to maintain contact with his constituents. He's got a telephone, he can maintain contact. He expects us to sit here as we're standing here right now. I've got a couple of constituents back home I would like to return telephone calls to at this very moment. I can't, there's no telephone at this desk. Eighteen years and longer we have had telephones here. The Senate hasn't, but we've been operating that way. We are the chamber which is closest to the people. We need these telephones. Vote to override the Governor and send him a message that we are the chamber that's closest to the people. Let the Governor sit over there in his ivory tower and play with his telephone and call whoever he wants. We'll talk with the people, we'll

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

deal with the people. Override this Veto on behalf of the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Matijevich, can you tell me approximately the percentage of budget cuts that the Governor's Office has taken over the last two years?"

Matijevich: "I understand from 90 to 91, was it? Ninety-one to ninety-two they took 11 percent."

Black: "Our figures indicate that it has been cut 18 percent, but we'll...we'll argue that point."

Matijevich: "That's the two year total you're talking about."

Black: "Right, right. An 18 percent reduction. Do you...do you know the percentage of cuts the Governor has made in those agencies directly under his control?"

Matijevich: "No, we don't."

Black: "It's approximately 30 percent."

Matijevich: "Well, God bless him. He's acting like it."

Black: "Well, I...I think we all understand the fiscal crisis that we're in."

Matijevich: "You ought to take a lesson from the last election.

Don't support your leader even when he's wrong."

Black: "Well I...I will certainly keep that in mind. ...Let me ask you another question. Did the General Assembly in fact, in fact, reduce their operating budget, or did we simply transfer some GRF costs to the Auditor General?"

Matijevich: "We did some of that, but we also reduced our budget."

Black: "But we didn't reduce our budget by a million dollars. We simply put that money...we made the Auditor General stand

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

alone, as you'll recall, and then said each agency would pay for the Auditor General's audits, whereas it was in our operations account prior to that. Is that not correct?"

Matijevich: "I'm checking that out, Bill. ...Bill, we looked at the budget from the Legislative Agencies as a whole.

That's the way we came to that figure."

Black: "Alright, I... I appreciate your response. Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman makes an interesting point and the previous speaker makes an even more interesting point. When we have just come through two of the most difficult budget years anyone in this chamber will hopefully ever have to go through, the first item of business after the election is to restore 1.8 million dollars into the General Assembly's operating budget as the previous mentioned, so we can have telephones at our desks. are people in my district who cannot afford a telephone in their house. We aren't paying our bills, we're not out of debt, we have not cut our budget by a million dollars. played a shell game last year, we all know it. If you want to go back home and face the electorate two years from now and say the first thing you did in a Lame Duck Session was to put a million bucks back in your operating account, then you vote for this Motion. I don't intend to, I don't think any of us should. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the last week I have had a steady stream of mail from different agencies and people in our communities who use the services of those agencies. They've been asking me and they've been asking you to override some Veto Motions in the Appropriation process. They have been in my

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

office already this morning. I have been called off the floor twice to override some Vetoes. I have made promises. It bothers me, it bothers me deeply when the first thing, the very first thing we're going to consider is our own fiscal needs in relation to a \$1.8 million veto of the Appropriation that was made for this General Assembly. Has anyone, has anyone been inconvenienced in manner, other than the fact that we do not have telephones here on the floor and we have re...no use of the telephones on our desks. I don't believe and I don't know if you can, but I don't believe I can go back to those forty empty beds that are going to be in my local mental health institution and talk to the parents of those people that seen their loved one moved out into a setting, a community setting of which they do not approve. Let's not show greed, and I'll spell it, 'g r e e d', let us not show greed on our very first vote here. I urge a 'no' vote on this Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr...Mr. Speaker...I would like to tell the Assembly that the four Leaders negotiated with the Governor in good faith on the restoration of our budget. The Governor wanted \$200,000,000 restored to his budget, the four Leaders agreed to restore his budget and after we went home, the Governor used his veto pen. Now, many of you know that the citizens of Illinois demand more and more information, demand more and more services from the General Assembly Members and with one hand tied behind our back, we can't...give them their due. Now I'm understanding that for us to absorb this money, there's going to be a massive layoff December the first of both Republican and Democratic secretaries. In this case, though I think we should make

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

the Governor...keep his word, in that he negotiated with the four Leaders as long as we restored the \$210,000.000 in his budget, he wouldn't touch our budget, and he did."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "...Speaker, could we have a little order. I never ask for order but...Speaker....now."

Speaker McPike: "Give the Gentleman your attention, please."

Matijevich: "...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Please. We would like to have some quiet on the floor."

Matijevich: "I want...I want the Republicans... you know, I have often been accused of being political and...and I want the Republic...I want the Republicans especially to listen to this and think for a moment for once that I am not being political. I may be... I may be accused of being institutionally political, but that's all. Let me tell you what we always have done since I've been in this General Assembly. Always, and I was Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. We always had an agreement with the Constitutional Officers, including the Governor, that we...we be kind if you want to use that word to your own Appropriations, that you consider that the Constitutional Officers and the General Assembly know what they have to work with. Now I think that you are all Constitutional Officers, you are the General Assembly and that we always had that agreement so that we knew when we adjourned that that's how much money we had to appropriate so that that Constitutional Officer, so that the General Assembly knew how much they could work with and that was always lived up to. Every Governor, be he a Republican or a Democrat, lived up to that. This is the first time, the first time that any Governor, any Governor violated that, so that when

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

we adjourned, the Speaker, the Senate President, the Minority Leader and the Minority Leader in the Senate then realized that they couldn't appropriate...or couldn't live within that budget, and I believe that all of the Floor Leaders, all of the Floor Leaders in the House and the Senate, were very conservative in their estimates on what they could live with. Because of the Governor's action, the Speaker and the President and the Minority Leaders had to take some extreme steps to live within that. I think they were overly extreme, but the reason that I wanted you to listen to that closely is because what you do today is going to determine what is going to happen this next fiscal year. If you are going to allow this to happen, you are really punishing yourselves. You're punishing yourselves as an institution. I recall here just a moment...just a little while ago when somebody asked me after...because I am going to leave, you know...'What, what are you going to do as far as the General Assembly? What are your thoughts?' And I said, 'My thoughts are that Members in the General Assembly too often, too often don't tell the voters what's important to th...most important to them, and that is the General Assembly as an institution, you have to protect your own institution.' That's what this vote is all about. I urge you to restore these funds if you believe, if you believe in the General Assembly as an institution, and let me tell you the guy that's leaving, I still believe in it and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

House. This is not normal times. Everywhere in the nation we are finding that we're in fiscal crisis. I commend the Governor for suggesting that the General Assembly be just like every other branch of government and every other agency, to take the 2% cut across the board. That 2% was agreed upon by the Speaker, and he chose to cut the phones, he chose to make those other cuts. He could have done it in other ways, that was his choice. This Body has to set the example, we are no better or no worse than the state agencies that provide service. I commend the Governor and I think that we should follow his Veto and sustain it, and I would ask this Body to do so. To set the example for the rest of this State."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund to explain his vote."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this receives the requisite 60 votes, I request a verification."

Speaker McPike: "Well, the Members are here, but the Chair will certainly go along with your request, but the Membership is here. This Motion requires 60 votes. Representative Madigan. Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I did not intend to speak on this Motion, but I heard a previous speaker state that this was...that the Governor's reduction was agreed. I just want everybody in this Body to know there was no agreement on this Governor's reduction, there was no consultation as there were with others who had their budgets reduced by the Governor's Office. We simply got a call one day, and we were told his 'Imperial Highness' has decided that this is what's going to be. And here it is, take it or leave it, so that's why we are supporting this Motion, and I know you may wish to support your Governor, you may wish to support your political party Member, but

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

understand this is a matter between the Legislature and the Executive, and if you wish to be trampled, so be it. I don't. I recognize our place under the Constitution of this State as a legitimate department of this government entitled to be funded at the level that we determine is appropriate for operations. We cooperated with the Governor on the reductions, there was no notice on this reduction and you can see that I completely resented it, and I support the Motion. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund withdraws his request for a verification. On this mo...Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 68 'ayes' and 47 'noes'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores this line item. Representative Saltsman on a Motion, on Page 9 of the Calendar. Motion number one. Mr. Saltsman. Mr. Saltsman, there must be something wrong with your microphone, we'd ask you to speak from Mr. Edley's desk. Mr. Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #1, Item Veto be overridden on House Bill Article SB226, Page 661, line 215, Page 62 line override, and I ask for the support of this Motion. When we left here July 1st, again the agreed Bill process, everyone here knows what problems we have had with our tax increment financing. Everyone here today knows argument on tax financing and we had the TIF proposal before us, we actually owed these districts \$26,000,000. I was ashamed to go back to my district and to tell the other dis...tax financing districts in this State, that we only had \$12,000,000 to allot them and give them for the \$26,000,000 that they generated in their districts. This

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

was a shortchange and naturally most of us were embarrassed by it. But even at the \$12,000,000 we cooperated with the Governor's agreement, we cooperated with the Leadership's agreement and the budgeteers that brought this piece of legislation back to us. The Revenue Budget would not have been passed and we would not have been out of here on July the 2nd if this was not included. We would have been here another fifteen days, because it affects both sides of this This is not a partisan problem, it affects both aisle. sides of this aisle and we who have these districts in our territories, know what the sacrifice was and know that we have broke a commitment. At 12 million, we still broke a commitment, and next year we are not going to get out of here with...with as little as 12 million, we're going to have to have more to fill our obligations to we owe...what we owe these municipalities. If this is an example of the agreed Bill process, then we'll stay at a gridlock next year until we get a better commitment than we have had at the present time. I ask for the passage of this Motion for the line item override, and please ask for everyone's support on it."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, this Motion will require 71 votes, and on the Motion, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I'm certainly sympathetic with the plight that is created for TIF districts, I would also suggest to you that a decision was made to continue to honor the Surcharge Funds which are five times or more the amount of these funds. But the more important issue, the more important issue at this point, is to suggest this money is not made or created. It has to be obtained in some fashion. Now, if the budget is in balance, and I would suggest that it is a very fragile balance, if indeed

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

it is, then we have an obligation at this point to suggest from what source we are going to obtain \$12,000,000 in order to restore it to the budget. If the Sponsor of this Motion or those that vote for it know of some secret fund, of some unexpected revenue to accommodate the \$12,000,000, then I hope they will let me know about that, because you see, I made a promise that I was not going to spend money that we don't have, and at this point, we don't have it. If we had the \$12,000,000 then this is the place where we should spend it, but we do not. If you intend to vote in favor of this, please understand that there's \$12,000,000 that has to come out of the budget some other place. I don't know where that would be. I hope you do if you intend to vote in favor of this. I cannot."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I Ropp: think any of us want to see the State go in the red, but I think what is equally important in this whole process that we are all a very vital part of, and that is integrity and trust in the system, and what we had established a number of years ago was to attempt to stimulate blighted areas in our respective communities in our respective districts, and that's what this Bill attempted to do. We have in fact attempted to stimulate economic growth in a number of ways. Providing opportunities for jobs which in turn provide for taxes that they pay because they are employed. Ladies Gentlemen, this is clearly an attempt to go against our word as the Legislature in the State of Illinois. should not, even though this is \$12,000,000 and it's a sizable amount, should not go back on our word because if we go back on our word, clearly we are going to put many of cities, many of these municipalities in deep these

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

financial trouble too, and obviously they're going to look back at us and say, 'Well, you didn't keep our...your word, why should we keep our word.' Ladies and Gentlemen, this is what will continue to help keep those tax dollars coming in from those communities, so that we don't have to put more money into programs like public aid for the fact that some of these people may not have jobs tomorrow. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a vote that is needed in order to maintain our integrity and our word as a Legislative Body."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. T rise in support of this Motion also. You know there is 136 tax increment financing districts in the entire State of Illinois, and the sales tax TIF Program has been going on for quite some time. Again when we talk obligation that...that we have in our relationship with local governments, we should live up to that obligation. The surcharge dollars that we finally were able to convince the Governor to keep for local government for the next fiscal year, really had nothing...nothing to do at all with the scheme of things as far as the sales tax TIFS are concerned. We should restore these dollars...every...there are many Legislators in this Body, Republicans as well Democrats, that have TIFS in their districts that count on these dollars to help retire these bonds. Now if they don't get this money back to help retire these bond programs economic development within their respective communities, they may have to refinance these bonds and sometimes may not...may not be able to get a good rate or not a good rate. They may not be able to find the adequate financing, so it's very important, it's highly important that we put these dollars back into this fund so we can get them

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

distributed back to the local communities."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I stand in support of this Override Motion. The State of Illinois had a commitment. We had a commitment to finance districts long before we increment had the the...to surtax. commitment to the Α previous speaker...speaker mentioned that...this amount \$12,000,000 is not nearly the amount that municipalities get in their...their surtax. Well that may not be except for those 136 communities that...that dedicated an area for a tax increment finance district committed to repaying If this commitment is not lived up to for the 12 bonds. million, which is a whole lot less then the 28 million that should be, many of these communities are going to have to raise property taxes and go out to meet the bonding commitment they made to develop their tax increment finance districts, so I stand in support of this Amendment. dollars were there, they were collected, sent to the Department of Revenue in the sales tax, and I think we are only obligated and rightfully giving these districts what

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If ever there were a clear cut issue on the State keeping its word, it's this one. There seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding about what a tax increment finance district is. Once these bonds are sold and the agreement is made, then we are no longer talking about an appropriation or a granting program. What this becomes is a pass through of either real estate or sales taxes to retire bonds, so it is totally inappropriate for us to

they deserve and I stand in support of the Motion."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

encourage or permit a community to sell bonds in reliance upon a TIF funding process, and then turn around and say, 'Well, there is no money' after those bonds are sold. It is the gravest of violations of what makes the whole system work from a financial responsibility standpoint. I would strongly urge you to look at this and to vote to help the State keep its word to these communities so that they do not have to take emergency measures to retire these bonds. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. Once again the other side of the aisle and the Governor seem to be afflicted with the belief that we have a balanced budget. And not only are they afflicted with that...mistaken belief, but now they've acquired another malady, that is sticky fingers. This money does not belong to the State. It is sales tax money generated by the local unit of government and that the State had pledged to return to them. It's not even the full amount that they are due. The full amount would be somewhere around \$28,000,000. Last year the appropriation was about \$18,000,000. This is only \$12,000,000 of money that should never have been included in the Governor's budgeting process for State operations. The only legitimate vote, the only vote that represents integrity of our process is an 'aye' vote, and I support this Motion."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. This Motion requires 71 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion,

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

there are 95 'ayes', 18 'noes'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails and is declared Veto of the Governor hereby passed, the notwithstanding. Representative Edley. Motion #2 on the Calendar on page 9. Out of the record. Representative You don't wish call this, to Representative Phelps. David Phelps. On Motion #4."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to restore the funds in this line item of which will affect the public health basic grants. This was reduced that would affect all local health departments, especially in the rural areas and I would appreciate your positive consideration. This is the basic health grants that was cut in the budget that really badly impacts the rural health departments in each county. Those of you that are impacted by that realize the problems that we have. So I appreciate your help."

Speaker McPike: "Alright now, on the Gentleman's Motion. This

Motion requires 60 votes. The Motion is to restore, and on
the Motion, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "Representative, I admire the effort that you're making, but would you explain to me, is the million dollars in a grant line? Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Ryder: "Alright. What was the total on that grant line?"

Phelps: "I believe it's a million dollars."

Ryder: "I'm sorry, Representative, I could not hear you."

Phelps: "I believe it's \$1,000,000. I believe."

Ryder: "So the \$1,000,000 completely eliminated the line?"

Phelps: "Yes."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Ryder: "Representative, is it possible...that it could have been reduced from 8.8 million to 7.7 million in that line item?

Is that a possibility?"

Phelps: "Very much so. I think it is correct."

Ryder: "Okay, so we're not eliminating the line, we're simply reducing by a million, so approximately a one-ninth reduction. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Sounds right. I follow your math so far. That sounds pretty accurate. I'll follow the math in which you're laying out here."

Ryder: "Well, it's close enough for our work, I suppose."

Phelps: "Right."

Ryder: "Representative, these...were there any particular grants that were eliminated by category or by any special items, or were they simply in general to your knowledge?"

Phelps: "In general, to the respect that it affects health departments on a local level, but it impacts, I believe, in a disparity manner...rural areas that so badly need this money for preventive items that can cost the State more as we progress. So we're talking about 80 local health departments that are affected by this one million reduction, which I think is unfair."

Ryder: "And finally, Representative, I realize that a million dollars in the amount of the budget that we have is not a great deal; however, I was wondering if you are of the opinion that we have extra revenue to substantiate the return of this million dollars?"

Phelps: "None other than what I heard the Governor Edgar announce as I was traveling in my district a couple three weeks ago, and the fact that the economy had improved in this State, so perhaps we might have some optimism there."

Ryder: "Thank you. To the issue, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Gentlemen, although the Sponsor is certainly well-intentioned and I believe that in good times this would be a good place to spend a million dollars, I cannot in good conscience suggest that having all the other cuts that we've made, that this one is appropriate as well. The Legislature's job is to submit a budget to the Governor. The Governor's job is to work within that budget and to veto those portions of the budget in order to make the budget balance. I believe the Governor did that, I believe that we would be irresponsible were we to be part of restoring to the budget, items even as well-intentioned as these items. For that reason, I stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize as the previous speaker had pointed out, that to ask to restore funds at a time which we're facing is, is quite a challenge, but if you'll look at how these type of funds will penetrate to the basic problems that face state government in the way the spiraling costs is generated when we do not take care of preventive measures that just a little money can go so much farther in trying to prevent that from happening. That's where I am coming from on this. I believe we fought to restore this money last spring, we did restore it, the Governor has vetoed it, and I move to restore this essential. It's not elaborate, but essential funding. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion,

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

there are 65 'ayes' and 45 'noes'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores this line item. Representative Flowers on Motion #3."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, drug abuse and addiction is a serious problem affecting this entire state. So therefore, it is our responsibility to restore...the \$1.3 million DASA as lost through the...the Governor's budget cut, so I'm asking this Body to help me override the Governor's Veto. I will be more than happy to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, this is a...the Lady's Motion is to restore, and this Motion requires 60 votes. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield to questions, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Flowers."

Ryder: "Thank you. Representative, the line item that was...that was cut, was for what purpose, please?"

Flowers: "It was for addiction treatment and related services."

Ryder: "And what's the amount of the...reduction?"

Flowers: "One point three million."

Ryder: "And, what was the reason that was given for that amount?"

Flowers: "What was the reason for the reduction?"

Ryder: "When the Governor did his Veto."

Flowers: "According to the Governor's Message, and I quote, 'I would not be reducing the funds in better fiscal times for the State, but an Appropriation above my recommendation level was not affordable.'"

Ryder: "Okay, and do you have re....I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. Please."

Flowers: "No, go on."

170th Legislative Day

- November 17, 1992
- Ryder: "And you have reason to believe that there is an extra \$1.3 million somewhere to cover this?"
- Flowers: "What we did, we took it out of their budget in other areas."
- Ryder: "Just one moment. This Motion puts it...takes it from one area and puts it someplace else. Is that what you're telling me?"
- Flowers: "We're not taking anything out of their budget, we're just restoring the 1.3 million."
- Ryder: "Alright. As the...as the budget stands now, with the \$1.3 million cut, is not the budget still over the previous operating budget?"
- Flowers: "Are you asking...I could not hear the question."
- Ryder: "My question, I think, and the appropriate answer is, this is part of the increase to that budget over the previous year's operating budget. They're already getting more money now than they did before. Is that correct?"
- Flowers: "According to the information that I have, this is a brand new line and it came from various old lines within the budget and DASA did reduce their operation maintenance."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Representative. To the issue, Mr. Speaker, if I may. This is one that I really wish that I could vote for. This is one that makes sense to me. Unfortunately, the way that we are forced to address it at this point, is that you're adding back \$1,300,000, and that's money that we don't have. Now, if I had some evidence that we had that money, this is one of the first places that I would put it, because I think that this is an area that has some need. But it is not there. It is...we don't have the money. Now, we folks, more importantly, you on the Democratic side made some very, very tough cuts in the

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

spring when you were trying to act like Republicans. You made some very, very tough votes. Now, after the election, you're coming back and spending money that we don't have. It's confusing to me somewhat, and as a result, until I have some evidence that we have additional funds, I have to reluctantly oppose spending money that we don't have. This is one of the places I'd spend it if I could, but I can't spend money that the State doesn't have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Ιt a question of whether we're going to spend this \$1.3 million, but how we're going to spend it. The programs that this money would support are programs that make it possible for pregnant women to rid themselves of their cocaine alcohol habits before their babies are born. We saw some of the babies that were born because of these programs, saw them in this chamber just a few minutes ago. Healthy babies, babies who were born without drugs in their system. At Hay Market House in Chicago, there's a waiting list of pregnant women who want help to make sure their babies can be born drug free. If we don't fund this \$1.3 million the program that makes sure the babies are born healthy, we're going to pay much higher costs but we're going to spend at least as much as \$1.3 million to take care of those high risk drug addicted babies in high perinatal nurseries. How much does that cost? A thousand bucks a day, \$2,000 a day. Give me a break. Every single Member who ran for reelection November 3rd, talked about the importance of prevention programs, talked about the necessity of making sure our children get off to a healthy start. The way to show the voters that you meant it when

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

you said it, is to spend this \$1.3 million for preventive services this year, not to spend the same or more in the very same year to pick up the pieces when we drop the ball. I urge your support for this Override Motion."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Hultgren, 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 64 'ayes' and 41 'noes'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House restores this line item. Motion #5, Representative LeFlore."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #5, this Motion will LeFlore: restore \$1.4 million GRF Reduction Veto by the Governor. By the Home Service Program, the Governor's original budget request for the Home Service Program was \$60.9 million GRF. This was a 4.6 million GRF reduction from our FY92, estimated expenditures and represented 2.7 million....that represents 2.7 million people decline in the client being served top of the client intake closure. So this is really dealing with the intake and...the Department of Rehab....Rehabilitation need these dollars, so I'm asking you for your support. I be willing to answer any questions."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder. Again, this Motion requires 60 votes."
- Ryder: "I'll be brief. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this one, it is not an issue as to whether we have the money or not. It's apparent that the Majority wishes to spend money that we don't have, but on this one there's even a more significant issue. This gives raises to caretakers in this

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

program when we denied those raises to caretakers in every other program. This picks out one group and says, 'In tough times you're entitled to a raise', but says to everybody else, 'You're not'. I don't understand how we are able to pick and choose those groups especially when this line item received over a million dollars worth of additional money so we could serve more clients. Now what we are going to do, is give raises so we serve less clients. I don't know if we're....we have the people that we serve at heart or the employees at heart. In any event, we don't have the money in the pocketbook to take care of either one. We don't have the money, I suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?.' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 60 'ayes' and 49 'noes'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House restores this line item. Representative LeFlore on Motion #6. Robert LeFlore on Motion #6."

LeFlore: "...Let's table #6...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Novak. Motion #8."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we accept Motion #8 to restore 73.2 thousand dollars to the Department of Public Health to restore the dol...needed dollars to maintain their fluoridation water sampling program."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder on the Motion."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a large amount of money, but let me tell you the work that you've done so

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

far. You've overridden, if you're successful on this issue, over \$17,600,000. That's what you've done. Now the 73,000 is a small part of that, and it may be a very worthy occasion, but you can't tell me that \$17,000,000 is small change. You can't tell me that somehow we're going to pull \$17,000,000 out of the air because those of you that work in the appropriation process know we don't have that money. It may be well-intentioned, but we don't have it. We don't even have the 73,000 that the Gentleman is asking for now. Seventeen million that we've overspent today. I oppose the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I support Representative Novak's Motion to override. This water testing is done for many small villages and water districts in downstate Illinois as well as all of Illinois, and many of these districts simply cannot afford to do their own testing with State specifications and so forth. Granted, the last speaker said this is small change, and it really is in the big line item, but this is one of those where we can help those small communities and I support the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative Novak. Is Representative Hartke talking about the same Bill?"

Novak: "Pardon me, Representative Black, I could not hear you, please."

Black: "Representative Hartke spoke in favor of your Motion. I'm not sure he's talking about the same matter. He's talking

- 170th Legislative Day November 17, 1992 about EPA testing of municipal water supplies. Right?"
- Novak: "No. This is...this is the Department of Public Health."
- Black: "It has nothing to do with...."
- Novak: "They test water supplies for fluoridation concentrations."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black, Representative Hartke was just talking."
- Black: "That's what I thought. I...I appreciate that clarification. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, Representative Hartke, now did you want to address this Motion or...Representative Hartke?"
- Hartke: "No, if I spoke in there I was talking about another
 piece of legislation. I'm sorry."
- Speaker McPike: "Did you want...The question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. This Motion requires 71 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, inquiry of the Chair. Did you indicate this...this vote needed 71 votes? This is a simple restoration, isn't it? Just requires 60."
- Speaker McPike: "Is this a...total of...Line Item Veto or a Reduction Veto?"
- Novak: "It's a total line item."
- Speaker McPike: "It's a total Line Item Veto, it requires 71 votes."
- Novak: "Okay, my mistake."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 63 'ayes' and 49 'noes' and the Motion fails.

 Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

in the Chair."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "On page 13, on the Order of Motions, we have House Bill 4213. Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 77(e), I move to discharge the Committee on Personnel and Pensions from further consideration and pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the Table, suspend Rule 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Calendar Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I don't want to just simply object for the purpose of objecting. Can the Sponsor give a little more explanation as to what is involved in the Bill and what his intentions are if the Bill should proceed?"
- Wolf: "Yes, Representative. House Bill 4213 will be used for pension legislation, and hopefully, it will be an Agreed Bill."
- Black: "What kind...is it...I think there's so many different pension Bills floating around. Which one is this one?

 This doesn't have anything to do with the TRS Bill, does it?"

Wolf: "No, it doesn't. Not at this point, it doesn't."

Black: "It certainly narrows it down. I... Alright, I..."

Wolf: "Representative, I don't want to exclude that possibility."

Black: "Okay, I understand. Thank you very much, Representative.

Inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. Does this Motion require 71 votes?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Yes, it does."

Black: "It does. Alright, thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All

170th Legislative Day

- November 17, 1992
- in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 8 voting 'present', and the Motion having received the required vote is hereby declared passed. And the Bill will be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4213, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code...or the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf, are you ready with House Bill 4216?"
- Wolf: "Madam Speaker, we wanted that to go to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, 4213. Let's go to 4216."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wolf, on House Bill 4213, did you wish to have the Bill remain on Second Reading or on Third Reading? It had no Amendments."
- Wolf: "Leave it on Third, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. Then we'll proceed with House Bill 4216, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on Personnel and Pensions from further consideration and pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the Table, suspend Rule 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Calendar Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield on

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

a question as to the purpose of this Bill?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Yes, can you tell the Body what the intent of 4216 will be?"

Wolf: "Yes, Representative. This Bill will be used to make two changes in the downstate firemen's pension system to bring it on a parity with the downstate police."

Parke: "Do you know if this is...will this be part of the Agreed Bill process?"

Wolf: "This Bill is not part of the agreed Bill process, and in the presentation of the Amendment that we will put on that Bill, I would be glad to explain it."

Parke: "Well, if it's not part of the agreed Bill process, then I would ask the Body not to approve this Bill for whatever the intent is. We are always negotiating in pension initiatives as part of the agreed Bill process, and it disturbs me that this may not be part of that, and if it's not, then I would ask the Body to defeat this Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wolf to close."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just move for adoption of the Motion and as a response to the previous speaker, I would indicate to you that the...as a matter of explanation of the agreed Bill process, I would remind the Body that the agreed Bill pension process is composed of three parts: Number 1, covering the five state funded systems; Number 2, covering the downstate firefighters downstate police and the municipal employees; and Number 3, Chicago and Cook County. Now the downstate firefighters and the downstate police systems negotiations have been in a stalemate for the last four years. And there is now some question as to whether or not such negotiations have proceeded in good faith. It's on this basis that the two

- 170th Legislative Day

 changes to this system will be presented, and I would move
 for the support of this Motion."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ryder, the Gentleman was making his closing statement on the Motion. Let's call for the question. Representative Ryder, you wish to speak now?"
- Ryder: "No, I'm not speaking to the issue. I'm making an inquiry of the Chair as to the number of votes necessary for this Motion to pass?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Seventy-one votes will be necessary."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. On that, all in favor will vote 'yes', opposed will vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 77 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the Motion has passed.

The Bill will be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4216, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wolf."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216.

Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216 makes two changes in the downstate firemen's pension system. Number 1, it would allow parity in the widow benefits for downstate firemen in that it would put it on a parity with the downstate police, moving the percentage of benefits from 40% to 50%. Number

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

2, it would allow a widow of a downstate fireman to remarry and not lose the pension benefits that were accrued. I believe this benefit would be effective July 1, 1993. I would move for adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, this is...this initiative is disturbing in that this will be an unfunded mandate that will be passed on to the local municipal governments which in turn must come up with the cash to pay for this benefit. Though the benefit itself is something that is worthy of consideration, it is worthy of consideration only in the contents of...the context of the agreed Bill process. If, in fact, we are going to do this, we need to figure out and negotiate what is the quid pro quo on this. Are we going to have a moratorium on pensions then and how long will it be? will we help the local municipal governments come up with this money? These are all questions that we have not come up with nor have we. We had this on the floor. It's now to be debated and I wish that we had taken time to have a meeting and gotten the players together and see if we can come up with some kind of negotiated benefit. Now I know that this has been going on for a long time, but times are different than they were even six months ago. Municipal government is in some real serious problems in terms of the amount of money that they are bringing in to run the local These changes are different than they were governments. six months ago. I think this needs more deliberation. needs more time than to push it through real quick in this Veto Session. I wish it was part of an overall package that we would go to the table and negotiate and have it

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

part of the agreed Bill process. And in that note then I would ask the Body to not accept this Amendment and to defeat it even though the underpinning of it has...has a worthwhile consideration. I think it has to be part of an overall agreement that we do with our local municipal governments and the downstate firefighters."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Two things. First an inquiry of the Chair. Several Members are asking if this Amendment has been distributed, either sometime in the past or today? Most people do not have a copy of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "We will check, just a moment."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I understand that the Amendment has not been printed and distributed. Representative Wolf. Representative Wolf. We understand that the Amendment has not yet been printed and distributed. We wonder if we could take this Bill out of the record at this time and proceed to the next Bill."

Wolf: "Can we come back to this yet today, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Yes, that's our intention."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading.

House Bill 4217, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on Personnel and Pensions from further consideration and pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the Table, suspend Rule 27(e) and 37(g) and place on the Calendar Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

- 170th Legislative Day November 17, 1992

 Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask the Sponsor if he could tell the Body what the intention of this Bill might very well be on this one?"
- Wolf: "Representative Parke, at this point I don't know what legislation will go on this Bill. I would assume and I would hope that it would be an agreed Bill; however, I cannot promise that at this time."
- Parke: "Excuse me, I guess I'm kind of curious. You said you can't agree that it's a part of the agreed Bill process?"
- Wolf: "No, I don't believe I said that."
- Parke: "Oh, clarify it for me then, I want us and the Body to understand what you said."
- Wolf: "I said that I can't tell you at this time what legislation is going to go on this Bill. And I would hope that it would be part of the agreed Bill process."
- Parke: "But it, then again, it may not be part of the agreed Bill process. Is that true?"
- Wolf: "Well, Terry, you've been around this place as much as I have, and you know that anything can happen, so I wouldn't want to lead you along to believe that something wouldn't be put on here that possibly would. And I want to reemphasize that at this point I do not know what will go on this Bill. Possibly the Omnibus Bill will go on here, a Bill that we'll be meeting on tomorrow, as you well know."
- Parke: "Thank you. I do appreciate the frankness in which you've always dealt with me on this, and I appreciate that. To the Bill. The Body needs to understand that we do not know what this vehicle will be used for. If it makes you uncomfortable to vote for something that we have no idea ultimately what it will be, or what will be in the Bill,

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

you'll have to vote accordingly."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I defer to your expertise in matters of pension. How many, in your opinion, does this...I ask your opinion. Do you think we have enough vehicles currently alive to handle any pension problem or a situation that we might need to address between now and the end of this General Assembly?"

Wolf: "Well, Representative, no, I wouldn't want to say that. We have had instances in the past where we have had three or four Bills out there for pension purposes and thought that we had plenty of vehicles to do what we wanted to do. And then we have found that as events occur, we didn't have enough Bills out there to do the job, and we have had to take Bills from the Table and everything else. We don't intend to use any more Bills than we have to. And as I said before, I would hope that what we do will be on the agreed Bill process, but I wouldn't want to stand up before this House and promise you faithfully that maybe there wouldn't be something go on one of these Bills that possibly you wouldn't agree with."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. And I do appreciate your candor and your honesty. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion and would urge Members on my side of the aisle to vote 'no'. This lame duck session has the potential to do a great deal of good or a great deal of mischief. And since there are so many retiring Legislators, the more pension vehicles we have on the

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

floor, I say in all due respect to all my colleagues, the greater the opportunity for some kind of last minute mischief. I don't think we want this to occur. I don't think that it's the Sponsor's intent certainly to do this, but I personally feel we have enough pension vehicles to handle the business that we need to handle in this Veto Session. I intend to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Motion, and I would urge Members on my side to join with me and let's keep the number of vehicle Bills, particularly as concerning pensions, to a bare minimum during this Veto Session."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Immediately after the vote,

 I'm calling a House Republican Conference in Room 300 for

 approximately 30 minutes. Thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund, would you repeat your remark, please."
- Wennlund: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Immediately after this vote, I'm calling a House Republican Conference in Room 300. It will take approximately 30 minutes."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "We'll take that under consideration, but let's go ahead with the vote on the issue. The Gentleman has presented his Motion. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion has passed. The Bill will be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4217, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Wennlund, your request was for a 30 minute conference. The conference will then...Be back here on the House Floor at 2:45?"
- Wennlund: "Correct, Madam Speaker, and the conference is again in Room 300."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Republicans will go to a conference immediately in Room 300 and be back on the House Floor at 2:45. The House is...will be in recess for that time till 2:45. Representative Black, since we see you on the House Floor, is this a sign that the Republican Conference has adjourned and we can be under way?"
- Black: "Well, I can't speak as to the actual adjournment time. I just got a little nervous and thought I'd come out and see what you were doing, Madam Speaker, and so I just wanted to be here in case my colleagues needed me to remind them that perhaps we were moving on with business."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Well, we would certainly hope that we could, since the time..."
- Black: "I'm certain that they are... As we speak, I'm certain they're probably on their way."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The time requested was for 30 minutes, which expired at 2:45 and..."
- Black: "Well, Madam Speaker, you know how these caucuses go.
 I..."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "I don't know how the Republican Caucuses go, but obviously they are tardy today."
- Black: "Well, it's... They are trying to... They're most diligently doing the public's business, and it sometimes

- 170th Legislative Day

 takes a little longer than expected, but I shall inquire as to their return."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "We would hope that that could be speeded along."
- Black: "Thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Giglio is recognized for an announcement."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We just had the Pages pass out a little card for Senator Di Turi. That's just a reminder... All of you will receive notice that they are having a dinner for Senators and Reps. in the Stratton Building immediately after adjournment. So just a reminder that the Italian Restaurants are going to honor Rock with a dinner tonight right after adjournment at the cafeteria in the Stratton Building. So all the Reps...the House Members are invited. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The House will come to order. Members will be in their seats. Messages from the Senate.

 Introductions and First Readings."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction First Reading of Bills. House Bill 4244, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4245, offered by Representative Schoenberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961 by adding Article 21.3. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4246, offered by Representative Rice, a Bill for an Act to create the offense of carjacking, amending named Acts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4247, offered by Representative Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code by changing Sections 14-103.10 and 14-106. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4248, offered by Representative

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code by changing Section 5-167.1. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4249, offered by Representative Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code by changing Section 14-103.10. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4250, offered by Representative Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code by changing Section 14-103.10. First Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "...Matijevich. A Motion on House Bill 3877.

 Page 13 of the Calendar. On page 13...page 13 of the

 Calendar, Representative Matijevich, page 13 of the

 Calendar."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the Table and suspend Rule 37(g) and place House Bill 3877 on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 Representative Black. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? In an effort to move this along very quickly, I think we can handle this in two seconds."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes..."
- Black: "Representative, it's my understanding that you'll bring this back for purposes of an Amendment, one Amendment only, and that Amendment is an agreed Amendment. Is that your intent?"
- Matijevich: "That's my understanding and that's correct."
- Black: "Thank you very much. We raise no objection and the Bill should... I support the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker McPike: "And on the Motion, there being no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries.

 The House will stand in recess until the call of the Chair.

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

The Second Special Session of the General Assembly is now in order. Mr. Clerk, read the Proclamation."

Clerk O'Brien: "The State of Illinois, the 87th General Assembly Joint Proclamation.

WHEREAS, Job creation and economic development have consistently been at the top of the public agenda, and

WHEREAS, There has been extensive study and public discussion regarding the wisdom, viability and economic benefit of constructing an urban entertainment complex in the City of Chicago that would include land-based casino gambling; and

WHEREAS, Studies indicate that land-based casino gambling in the City of Chicago would have a profound positive economic impact on the Chicago Metropolitan Area and the State of Illinois; and;

WHEREAS, Private investors stand ready to invest \$2 billion in the construction of the urban entertainment complex, creating an estimated 7,700 new construction jobs; and

WHEREAS, Upon commencement of operation, an estimated 18,000 new jobs will be created at the site of the entertainment complex and 48,000 permanent off-site jobs will be created; and

WHEREAS, It is estimated that by the year 2001 the entertainment complex will generate as much as \$550 million in new tax revenue, with approximately \$370 million of this amount going directly to the State of Illinois; and

WHEREAS, The development of the urban entertainment complex will provide a significant boost to the Chicago hotel industry, which has suffered a decline in occupancy rates since the mid 1980s; therefore

PURSUANT TO Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Constitution, and in conformity with Section 1 of the Special

Session Act, Ill. Rev. Stat. (1991); ch. 63, par. 190 et seq., A

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY IS HEREBY PROCLAIMED

AND CALLED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The purpose of the Special Session shall be to consider and enact legislation necessary to permit the development, construction and operation of an urban entertainment center in the City of Chicago that includes land-based casino gambling operations; and
- 2. This Special Session shall convene at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 17, 1992, at the State Capitol in Springfield, Illinois.

Issued this 5th day of November, 1992.

Signed: Philip J. Rock, President of the Senate and Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves that the Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session be used as the Attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 1."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1. Resolved that the Clerk inform the Senate that a Majority of the House is assembled pursuant to the Joint Proclamation of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, convening a Special Session of the General Assembly and are now ready for the transaction of business."
- Speaker McPike: "All in favor of the House Resolution...

 Representative Matijevich moves that the House adopt House
 Resolution #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
 'ayes' have it. House Resolution #1 is adopted.

 Introduction and First Reading."

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill #1, offered by Representative Lang, a
 Bill for an Act in relation to economic development by the
 creation of an entertainment district in the City of
 Chicago, providing for its licensing and regulation and the
 disposition of the tax revenue derived therefrom and
 amending certain named Acts. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker...Speaker Madigan on a Motion on House Bill 1."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, my purpose...Mr. Speaker, my purpose offering this Motion is to expedite the consideration of this Bill in this Special Session. The Special Session has just begun today. The Bill has been introduced. My Motion would be to suspend the posting requirements to permit Committee of the Whole Hearing this coming Thursday before the entire House of Representatives. The reason for this is that Senator Rock in the Senate has scheduled a Committee of the Whole Hearing for Thursday morning. My thought is that if the House were to hold a Committee of the Whole Hearing on Thursday morning, we could accommodate the proponents of this proposal and the opponents who could be here in Springfield on the same day and could shuttle back and forth between the House and the Senate in terms of their appearances before the two Committees. Mr. I would now move that we suspend the posting requirements to permit a Committee of the Whole Hearing on this Bill this coming Thursday morning before the full House of Representatives."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 This Motion requires unanimous consent. And on the Motion,

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Is the Gentleman asking that we suspend Rule 20?"

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Black: "It's my understanding that even on a Committee of the Whole, no such business can be transacted without this Rule being suspended. Aren't you saying by a Majority vote?"
- Speaker McPike: "No. I said unanimous consent. Yes, that's correct, unanimous consent. This Motion requires unanimous consent. This Motion requires everyone, Mr. Black."

Black: "I...Is that the same as unanimous?"

Speaker McPike: "It's about the same."

- Black: "I see. Yeah, well, I would simply rise, Mr. Speaker, to...and four Members on my side of the aisle will join with me in asking that you have a recorded vote on the issue to suspend the Rules."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, if you object, that's all that you need to tell me."

Black: "I object, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker McPike: "Alright, Speaker Madigan, there's objections to your Motion."
- Madigan: "So I withdraw the Motion, Mr. Speaker, and ask that the Bill be sent to the Committee on Assignment for assignment to a committee."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws his Motion. House Bill 1 has been read a first time. Mr. Clerk, Committee on Assignments. Representative Matijevich now moves that the Second Special Session stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:35 p.m. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Second Special Session stands adjourned. The Regular Session will now come to order. Representative Giglio in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "On page 14 of the Calendar, House Bill 4216,

 Second Reading, I believe. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of
 this Bill?"

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

- Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill is on Second Reading and was being held for Floor Amendment #1 to be printed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wolf. Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216. It's on the Order of Second Reading."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216.

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 4016...4216 makes two changes to the downstate firefighters pension system. Number 1 is that it would allow parity for widow benefits of downstate firemen's pension system comparable and equal to that of the downstate policemen's pension system. Second, the Amendment would allow the widow of a downstate fireman to remarry and not lose the pension benefits that were accrued. The remarrying provision would go into effect on July the 1, 1993. Mr. Speaker, I would move for adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I want to make one thing very clear. I don't rise in opposition to what the Sponsor is attempting to do in equalizing a survivor's benefit for our firefighters. I don't think anybody in this chamber would rise in opposition to what attempting to do. But there, unfortunately, is a portion of this Amendment that flies in the face of what this state told us clearly on November the electorate of Now if you vote 'yes', then you are ignoring 3rd. approximately 85% of your constituency voted on an advisory referendum that said clearly, stop mandates unless you are going to fund them. Let me read to you what this Amendment does basically. This Bill includes an exemption from the

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

State Mandates Act requirements for state reimbursement. Local governments, therefore, would be responsible for all increased costs. While what the Gentleman is attempting to do is laudable, and I'm sure that we can work it out in the next session, what we have here before us at this moment flies in the face of what our constituency statewide told us in no uncertain terms they want stopped. these Bills that are going to cost the local property taxpayer to be stopped. No ifs, and, buts or ors. were no... There couldn't possibly be a confused message from that mandate's advisory referendum. opposition to the Gentleman's Motion simply because of the mandate's exemption that is included in here, which I think was made very clear to everyone in this chamber, the taxpayer said no more unfunded mandates and that's what And that is the only reason I rise in reluctant this is. opposition. The Municipal League is adamantly opposed to this. I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, have no objection to the underlying matter of this Bill...this Amendment. However, I must point out that this does go beyond the agreed Bill process which has effectively worked in this Body for at least six to eight years. And I think that we should say that we want the agreed Bill process. The cost on this is the average increase in employer cost, and that's municipal employer cost, a percentage of payroll is 1.3%. That means that the annual employer's contribution will be \$3,000,000. Now you put that on top of all the other things that have gone on with inflation and the low collection of tax revenue that our municipal governments have had in the last year, year

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

and a half, you're just compounding the problem that they have to face with. In essence what you are doing is you're telling that the local municipal government has got to raise taxes on the local homeowner and when they raise taxes on the local homeowner, if you vote for this, you are telling them that they have to increase property taxes, and it's because of your vote on this Amendment. Let us wait until spring. Let us negotiate with the downstate firemen. They have some legitimate concerns. Let's go through the agreed Bill process. Let's wait till the spring. And unfortunately I must ask the Body to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria,
Representative Saltsman."

"Yes, I like to remind...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Saltsman: previous speaker, there's no such thing as an agreed Bill process anymore. By giving the agreed Bill process, Municipal League has thrown everything the Illinois policemen and firemen have asked for into a gridlock and just says no to practically everything that's possible. The Illinois Municipal League who are members of Illinois Retirement System, the Illinois Municipal Retirement System, the IMRF, they are members. Municipal League themselves are. And what did they do last They made an agreement on a Bill that gives them a thirteenth paycheck. They came in and made an agreement, the Municipal League did, for a Bill to give them a 8.5% increase in their pension, 1/12...a 1/12% of a raise for every twelfth month they get that thirteenth check. that was alright, because the members out there lobbying against the policemen and firemen, they get that thirteenth Their retirees get it and they're going to get paycheck.

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

it, too. So we forget about the mandates if there's a Bill there that pads the pockets of the Illinois Municipal That is just fine. And don't forget that League people. Bill went out of here with about 112 votes. So all of you people voted against this mandate's problem. Practically everybody on this floor voted against it. But now they IMRF made the agreement with the Illinois are...the Municipal League, that's fine. We...They don't anything this year, so they're telling no to everybody else. And let me tell you something. These cities are not raising taxes over pension systems, because they're not funding them properly right now. In the City of Peoria in the last eight years, they have underfunded \$24,000,000 in that pension system. So how can it raise taxes when they do not put in what is mandated by the Department of Insurance. Our Department of Insurance tells them how much put in. They don't put it in anyhow and they won't do anything to crack the whip on them. This doesn't raise taxes. How can you raise taxes when the city don't put the money in anyhow? If that was good enough for the Illinois Municipal League, it's good enough for the other workers within the state programs. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to request a recorded Roll Call vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wolf, to close. Representative Wolf...to close."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just in response to a couple of the remarks on the other side of the aisle. I do agree with the agreed Bill process. I'm a 100% subscriber to that process, but the negotiations on

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

particular system, that is for the downstate firefighters and the police have been in negotiation for the past four years with no agreement. And this is the basis on which these two benefit changes have submitted. I'd like to cite to you an instance that happened to me back in the latter part of June of year, during the last two weeks of June. I had drafted a proposal for the downstate firefighters and the downstate police that had a cost factor of six and a half million dollars or a 1.2% payroll cost impact, and I called the legislative representative of the Municipal League to come into my office. I went over these provisions with him and said he would take it back to the Municipal League and have a discussion on it. After waiting for several days, I received no reply, so I got in touch with the legislative representative and he told me that the Municipal League had rejected that proposal. Now they rejected that proposal despite the fact that it had only a cost impact of 1.2% of payroll as opposed to a proposal that they had agreed to three months prior to that, which had a cost impact of nine and a half million dollars or 1.8% payroll impact. Now when they turn down a proposal of this kind that was actually \$3,000,000 less than they had proposed three months prior, it really leads me into question as to whether or not they were entering into the agreed Bill process on a good faith basis. I would ask for your support of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216?' And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Novak,

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

'aye'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'yes' and 35 voting 'no' and 8 voting 'present' and Amendment #1 to House Bill 4216 has been adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of House Bill 4216."

Speaker Giglio: "It was only read a second time, Representative Wolf. This Bill's now on Third Reading. On page 6 of the Calendar under Total Veto Motions. Representative Ropp. Representative Ropp in the chamber? House Bill 1129. Out of the record. Representative Lang. Representative Lang. House Bill 2954. Out of the record. Representative Representative Novak. Out of the record. Representative LeFlore. Representative Bob LeFlore on House Bill 3032. Representative LeFlore. Out of the 3092 has been withdrawn. House Bill 3201, record. Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard on House Bill 3221. Out of the record. Representative Stern. Representative Stern, do you wish to call House Bill 3563? Out of the record. Representative Curran, 3587. Out of the record. Representative Kulas, 3605. Total Veto Motion. Out of the record. How about Representative McNamara on House Bill 4112? Representative McNamara, want to run with this Bill? Out of the record. House Bill Representative Wennlund, on a Motion. Representative Wennlund. Motion to take from the Table...and place on the Order of Second Legislative Day, House Bill 3475, page 13 of the Calendar. 3475."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to take House Bill

- 170th Legislative Day

 November 17, 1992

 3475 from the Table, suspend Rule 37(g) and place on the

 Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Does the Gentleman have leave by the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 188, offered by Representative Dunn. House Resolution 2572, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves..."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Also Senate Joint Resolution 187, offered by Representative Balthis."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich now moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2569, offered by Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Willie James Neal. And House Resolution 2571, offered by Representative White, with respect to the memory of Donald J. Nash."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves on the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolution is adopted. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand adjourned until 12:30 tomorrow. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The House now stands adjourned. Twelve-thirty tomorrow. Twelve-thirty Twelve-thirty tomorrow. The House now stands tomorrow. adjourned. Don't forget the Stratton Building for the Italian dinner for Representative Di Turi. Five-thirty. Senator Rock. Representative...For Rock is

170th Legislative Day

November 17, 1992

sponsoring...Senator Di Turi is sponsoring the Italian dinner for Senator Rock."

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS 93/02/26 PAGE: 001 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 10:59:47

87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

NOVEMBER 17, 1992

H3-0001 FIRST READING	PAGE	54
HB-0001 MOTION	PAGE	54
HB-2703 MOTION	PAGE	13
H3-3475 MOTION	PAGE	61
H 3877 MOTION	PAGE	51
He-4213 SECOND READING	PAGE	4 L
HB-4213 MOTION	PAGE	40
H4216 SECOND READING	PAGE	43
HB-4216 SECOND READING	PAGE	55
HB-4216 HOTION	PAGE	41
H3-4217 SECOND READING	PAGE	48
HB-4217 MOTION	PAGE	45
HI-4239 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
Hb-4240 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HB-4241 FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HL-4242 FIRST READING	PAGE	13
HB-4243 FIRST READING	PAGE	13
H3-4244 FIRST READING	PAGE	50
HL-4245 FIRST READING	PAGE	50
HJ-4246 FIRST READING	PAGE	50
HB-4247 FIRST READING	PAGE	50
H4248 FIRST READING	PAGÉ	50
HJ-4249 FIRST READING	PAGE	51
H3-4250 FIRST READING	PAGE	51
HR-0001 ADOPTED	PAGE	53
HR-0001 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	53

SULJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND KEITH MICHAELS	PAGE	l
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
JUDGE SHIFFMAN - SHEAR IN NEW MEMBERS	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	3
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	10
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	12
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	40
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	51
RECESS UNTIL CALL OF THE CHAIR	PAGE	51
HOUSE TO ORDER - SECOND SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	<i>5</i> 2
JOINT PROCLAMATION	PAGE	52
SECOND SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNED	PAGE	55
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	55
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	62
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	62
HOUSE - ADJOURNED	PAGE	62